

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-32934  
Issue No.: 2009, 4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 1, 2010  
DHS County: Macomb (12)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Linda Steadley Schwarb

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on September 1, 2010. Claimant appeared and testified. Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On March 18, 2010, claimant filed an application for MA-P and SDA benefits. The application requested MA-P retroactive to December of 2009.
2. On April 23, 2010, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
3. On April 28, 2010, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
4. Claimant, age 30, has a high-school education.

5. Claimant last worked in January of 2009 as a factory laborer. Claimant has no other reported relevant work experience. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of unskilled work activities.
6. Claimant has a long history of depression and anxiety with multiple psychiatric hospitalizations.
7. Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. His discharge diagnosis was bipolar disorder, depressed; post-traumatic stress disorder; generalized anxiety disorder; and attention deficit disorder. Claimant was given a GAF score of 35 upon discharge.
8. Claimant was hospitalized at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. His discharge diagnosis was post-traumatic stress disorder; depression, not otherwise specified; and opioid dependency in full early remission.
9. Claimant currently suffers from major depressive disorder, recurrent, severe without psychosis; generalized anxiety disorder; and post-traumatic stress disorder. Claimant's GAF score in [REDACTED] was 45.
10. Claimant has severe limitations upon his ability to understand, carry out, and remember simple instructions; use of judgment; ability to respond appropriately to others; and ability to deal with change. Claimant's limitations have lasted twelve months or more.
11. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who is so impaired as to be incapable of engaging in any substantial gainful activity on a regular and continuing basis.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (BAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for "disabled" as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“Disability” is:

...the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months ... 20 CFR 416.905.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, claimant is not working. Therefore, claimant may not be disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include:

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;
- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and
- (6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity

requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he has significant mental limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions; use of judgment; responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers, and usual work situations; and dealing with changes in a routine work setting. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant’s work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

In the third step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant’s impairment (or combination of impairments) is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant’s medical record will not support a finding that claimant’s impairment(s) is a “listed impairment” or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant’s impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, psychological findings, that claimant is not capable of the memory, use of judgment, ability to respond appropriately to others, nor ability to deal with change required by his past employment. Claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he is not, at this point, capable of performing such work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant’s impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant’s:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as “what can you still do despite you limitations?” 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS*, 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once claimant reaches Step 5 in the sequential review process, claimant has already established a *prima facie* case of

disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1984). At that point, the burden of proof is on the state to prove by substantial evidence that the claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity.

In this case, claimant has had a long history of problems with depression and anxiety. He has had numerous psychiatric hospitalizations. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist diagnosed claimant with major depressive disorder, recurrent, moderate; post-traumatic stress disorder; and panic disorder without agoraphobia; opioid dependence; and sedative, hypnotic or anxiolytic dependence. At that time, Claimant was given a current GAF score of 45. The psychiatrist indicated that claimant's highest GAF score in the previous year was 45. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist diagnosed claimant with major depressive disorder, recurrent, severe, without psychosis; generalized anxiety disorder; and post-traumatic distress disorder. The psychiatrist gave claimant a current GAF score of 45. On [REDACTED], claimant's MSW therapist diagnosed claimant with post-traumatic stress disorder; mood disorder; and opioid dependence in full sustained remission. The therapist gave claimant a current GAF score of 30 and opined that claimant was markedly limited in every area of understanding and memory, sustained concentration and persistence, social interaction, and adaption.

After careful review of claimant's extensive medical record and the Administrative Law Judge's personal interaction with claimant at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's mental health impairments render claimant unable to engage in work activities on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 11, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986). The department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that, given claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite claimant's limitations. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (BAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

A person is considered disabled for purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based upon disability or blindness or the receipt of MA benefits based upon disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in BEM Item 261. Inasmuch as claimant has been found

“disabled” for purposes of MA, he must also be found “disabled” for purposes of SDA benefits.

The Medical Social Work Consultant (MSWC), in conjunction with the Medical Review Team (MRT), is to consider the appropriateness of directing claimant to participate in appropriate mental health treatment as a condition of receipt of benefits. Unless the MSWC determines that claimant has good cause for failure to participate in mandatory treatment, claimant will lose eligibility for MA-P and SDA benefits. See BEM, Item 261, pp. 3 and 4, and BEM, Item 260, page 5.


Further, a referral is to be made to Adult Protective Services for an evaluation of possible financial management problems. Specifically, before SDA benefits may be paid to claimant, Adult Protective Services is to assess the appropriateness of a payee or conservatorship for claimant because of mental health or other problems which may prevent adequate management or discharge of financial or other personal affairs. See Adult Services Manual, Item 215.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant meets the definition of medically disabled under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs as of December of 2009.

Accordingly, the department is ordered to initiate a review of the March 18, 2010, application, if it has not already done so, to determine if all other non medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform claimant of its determination in writing. Assuming that claimant is otherwise eligible for program benefits, the department shall review claimant’s continued eligibility for program benefits in November of 2011.

The Medical Social Work Consultant, in conjunction with the Medical Review Team, is to consider the appropriateness of ordering claimant to participate in mandatory mental health treatment as a condition of receipt of benefits. Further, a referral is to be made to Adult Protective Services consistent with this Order.

  
Linda Steadley Schwarb  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 3, 2010

Date Mailed: November 4, 2010

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LSS/pf

cc:

